

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

<b>WILLIE EDWARD SNEED,</b>	:	
<b>Petitioner,</b>	:	
	:	
<b>v.</b>	:	<b>CIVIL ACTION NO. 06-5328</b>
	:	
	:	
<b>DEPUTY SECRETARY JEFFREY</b>	:	
<b>BEARD, <i>et al.</i>,</b>	:	
<b>Respondents.</b>	:	

**ORDER**

**AND NOW**, this 6th day of September 2018, upon careful and independent consideration of the Amended Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus [Doc. No. 31], and all related filings, it is hereby **ORDERED** as follows:

1. The Amended Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus [Doc. No. 31] is **DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE** and without an evidentiary hearing;
2. There is no probable cause to issue a certificate of appealability<sup>1</sup>; and
3. The Clerk of Court is directed to **CLOSE** the case.

It is so **ORDERED**.

**BY THE COURT:**

**/s/ Cynthia M. Rufe**

**CYNTHIA M. RUFÉ, J.**

---

<sup>1</sup> Petitioner has not made a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right; there is no basis for concluding that “reasonable jurists could debate whether . . . the petition should have been resolved in a different manner or that the issues presented were adequate to deserve encouragement to proceed further.” *Slack v. McDaniel*, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000) (internal quotation marks and citation omitted).